BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08654 861 5

No. 7586.162

GIVEN BY

Bostonian Society

REPLY

7586.162

TO THE ATTACKS

IN THE

BOSTON MORNING POST,

UPON

GOVERNOR MORTON.

BOSTON:
FELCH'S PRESS, 4 WATER STREET.
1846.

TO THE PUBLIC.

A FEW weeks since the Boston Post, contained, in two articles., a violent and unjust attack upon Governor MORTON. A proper regard for TRUTH and JUSTICE seemed to require a refutation of the charges, and an exposure of the *falsehood* and *malice* of the author. The following reply was prepared and sent to the editor of the Post; but he declined to publish it. The writer took much pains to derive his facts from the most reliable sources, and believes them to be entirely correct throughout.

Bostonian Society

7586.162

MARCUS MORTON.

To Col. Charles G. Greene, *Ed. Boston Post.*

In the Boston Post of the 17th and 18th ultimo, two articles appeared under the above title, in which the writer, under pretence of replying to two communications in the Washington Union, makes an *unjustifiable* attack upon Gov. Morton. I well know that you could not have written them, because you would not have stated so many "*false facts*," and because it is apparent in every sentence that the writer is a seeker for an office, to which his prospects may be increased by creating a vacancy in the Collector's office. Indeed the style of the composition, the mode of reasoning, and the disclosure of facts, which could be known to one individual only, and the recent examination of the council records by that individual, as clearly indicate the author to be B. F. Hallett, as if he had signed his name at length. This you know to be the fact, and we hold you responsible only for your omission to examine the articles, and to see that they were too full of errors to be entitled to a place in any respectable Journal.

I intended to have replied to the attacks immediately after their appearance; but the time required to get the evidence to refute so many misrepresentations, some of which was drawn from a distance, necessarily caused a good deal of delay.

As the Washington communications made no imputations upon the Post, nor even alluded to that paper, it had no occasion to reply. The cause assigned for writing the articles was not the *true* one, but only a pretence to cover the malevolent design or sinister purpose of the writer. Imputations upon the motives and conduct of a man whom the Democracy of Massachusetts have so long delighted to honor, will not be very easily believed by his

tried fellow soldiers of some forty campaigns, especially when made by a man who has so recently come into their ranks.

Some *political* enemy of Gov. MORTON having charged him with *abolitionism*, the writer in the *Washington Union* undertook to refute the charge. Mr. HALLETT, in the hope that it might prevent his confirmation by the Senate, has made an effort to sustain it. Where is his proof?

Gov. MORTON has been before the public constantly for more than thirty years. His public and private acts, writings and declarations, have been thoroughly examined. Where can a single word or act favoring *abolition* be found in his whole life? Where, we say?

He is openly and decidedly opposed to slavery. And what honest man in a free state does not avow the same doctrine. But he is utterly opposed to any interference with the domestic institutions of the Slave States, and firmly in favor of a full and fair execution of the provisions of the law and the Constitution on this subject. And such has ever been his practice. Look at his labor at the bar to defend a Virginian from the attacks of the abolitionists, when he attempted to reclaim his fugitive slave. Then, when the stranger was thrown into prison, and no member of the bar would appear for him, Gov. MORTON came forward, and at the risk of reputation and business, triumphantly vindicated the law from the assaults of violence and prejudice. See 2 Pickering, Commonwealth *vs.* Camillus Griffith. Is this *abolitionism?*

Mr. HALLETT brings forward the old and oft quoted letters to Eddy and to Whittier. Among the thousand letters written by the Governor, these only are relied upon. Why are all the others omitted? Because they would refute the charge. But why only *extracts* of these produced? Mr. Hallett has the letter to Eddy, for he first published it, and his friend Nayson has the one to Whittier, for Mr. W. says that he obtained it from him, "*under pretences of friendship to its author*," and "*withheld it from him, its rightful owner.*" Why should these men suppress any part but to gain an *unfair* advantage and to present the matter in an untrue light? If the whole letters had been published it would doubtlessly have appeared that they were private answers to private letters, asking for confidential replies. The one to Whittier appears to be in reply to one received long before, and to which an answer had

been promised; and both were manifestly written in great haste, and without any expectation that they would be published.

But, laying bare the private thoughts of the man, what do they amount to? A great abhorrence of Slavery in the abstract, but a strong opposition to any interference with the domestic regulations of the Slave States. Does he encourage abolitionists? On the contrary, in language of rebuke, he says to Mr. Whittier, a leading abolitionist, "*I am no political abolitionist. I think the ultra measures and doctrines of the two extremes, the North and the South, are alike unfavorable to the relief and the emancipation of the Slaves. And I cannot but think that the violent abolitionists of the North are answerable for some of the cruelties practised on the Slaves. I am also constrained to believe that while the great mass of the abolitionists are sincere in their efforts, and are governed by pure motives, many of their leaders are governed by selfish and sinister designs.*" Is this the language of an abolitionist?

Mr. HALLETT then says, that in 1843 the four or five abolitionists in the legislature "held the balance of power between the two parties," and intimates that the letter to Whittier was written to propitiate their favor, and adds, "Mr. MORTON *was elected Governor,—abolitionists voting for him.*" ABSURDITY! FALSEHOOD!! Court the favor of *abolitionists* by saying that their leaders (and no others could be in the Legislature) "*were governed by selfish and sinister designs!*" But further, not an abolitionist voted for Gov. MORTON. Mr. Whittier says (and so every one knows the fact to be,) "*The liberty men in the Legislature voted to a man for their own candidate, S. E. Sewall,*" and adds, "*I afterwards, as I had done before, used my best endeavors to prevent his (Morton's) election.*"

So much for Mr. HALLETT's insinuation that Gov. MORTON courted *abolitionists*, and so much for his assertion that they voted for him! But who makes this charge of *abolitionism* against Gov. MORTON? The man who, as editor of the "Advocate," sowed broad-cast anti-slavery doctrines—the man who published, with high commendation, Gov. MORTON's private letter to Mr. Eddy—the man who, in the Legislature of 1843, did more to disgrace the democratic party, by degrading proposals to *abolitionists*, than any one else—the man who, with the same authority, which the character mentioned in the 4th chapter of Luke had, made the insulting

proposal to an *abolition* member, that if he would vote for Gov. Morton, he should be elected into the council. The man who made this offer was B. F. Hallett. The member who spurned it was Lewis Williams.

Again, Mr. Hallett says the Executive of Virginia made a *requisition* on Gov. Davis for George Latimer, which he refused; and that "*in* 1843, *the requisition was renewed, and was also refused by* Gov. Morton." Here again Mr. Hallett, although having the best opportunity to know, is entirely mistaken in his facts. It is true that Gov. Davis refused the *requisition.* But it is wholly *untrue* that any *requisition* was made upon Gov. Morton; and therefore how he would have decided, had one been made, no one can tell. The printed resolves show that Gov. Morton was requested to *revise* the decision of Gov. Davis, which he most properly declined. What right had he to *reverse* or *revise* the decision of his predecessor?

Certain anti-slavery, anti-Texas, and highly objectionable resolutions, one in words used by the Hartford Convention, were passed in 1840 and 1843. But not one of them ever received the signature of Gov. Morton. Is this evidence of his *abolitionism?* But, says Mr. Hallett, he *forwarded* them agreeably to the request of the Legislature. And was it not his duty to do so? And if he had refused to comply with the unanimous request of the Legislature, who would not have considered the act as a gross and inexcusable violation of duty? Such are the futile attempts to support the charge of *abolitionism*, and made too by a man who not only did not object to these acts, but was advising and consenting to them when they passed.

But, says Mr. *Hallett*, Gov. Morton must be an *abolitionist*, because he appointed Ellis G. Loring to office. The statement of this transaction, occupying nearly a column in your paper, is marked by Jesuitry, chicanery, and falsehood throughout. I have endeavored to ascertain the exact facts in this case, and if anything can put to shame the author of the article, a simple statement of them will do so.

In 1843 two vacancies occurred in offices of masters in chancery, in this city. There were of course many candidates for them. Among the most prominent was Mr. Barstow, a young lawyer of respectability and promise. But to the first vacancy the Governor

thought proper to nominate a much older and a highly respectable lawyer, Mr. B. Sumner, and I believe all acknowledge the wisdom of the selection. Mr. Barstow removed to New Hampshire, and to fill the second vacancy, some of Mr. HALLETT's friends proposed him; and it was supposed that he was extremely anxious to obtain the office. And this no doubt was the cause of his violent opposition to the appointment that was made, and, in part, of his unrelenting hostility to Gov. MORTON.

Mr. LORING was a man whose thorough and minute knowledge of the law, especially on the chancery side; whose great accuracy and method in the transaction of business, and whose high integrity and extreme conscientiousness in all things, gave him peculiar qualifications for this place. The Governor nominated him. And Mr. HALLETT opposed his nomination at every step.

First, he alledged that he was a *whig;* a charge since repeated by his friend HENSHAW. But on inquiry the council found that he never gave a whig vote in his life, but uniformly voted for the democratic ticket; while Mr. HALLETT was writing and voting against us. This objection was then abandoned, as appears by Mr. HALLETT's own protest, published by himself, and the charge of *abolition* brought up against him.

The files of the LIBERATOR were examined, and after Mr. Loring had stood nominated for several weeks, the proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society in May, 1843, were, for the first time, brought to the knowledge of the Governor and Council. The resolves were highly reprehensible, and by no one more decidedly condemned than by Gov. MORTON. They had then just been published, and struck every one with astonishment. The nomination was postponed to inquire into the circumstances of the case, and the result was that the matter was explained in a way so satisfactory, that not a member of the council voted against Mr. Loring, except those who desired the appointment of Mr. HALLETT.

And what were the facts in this case? They were shortly these —that Mr. Loring had always opposed these resolutions whenever brought forward—that when present he had ever defeated them—that on the present occasion he had no knowledge he was named on the committee, or that any such resolves were presented till several weeks after they were passed—and that so far from approving or acquiescing in them he soon after went to New York,

attended an Anti-Slavery meeting, and made a most strenuous and able effort to get them rescinded; and failing in this, he withdrew from the Anti-Slavery board. With a full knowledge of these facts, Mr. HALLETT has endeavored to satisfy the public that Mr. Loring is responsible for those highly objectionable resolutions!! What dishonesty! What impudence!!! But see what *subterfuges* and chicanery is resorted to. Mr. HALLETT says in his pretended protest, of which we will say a word or two bye and bye, "*that said Loring, whose name is published in connexion with said resolutions, has never publicly disclaimed the same.*" This single sentence, with all its deceptive coloring and artful duplicity, speaks the facts in the case, as well as the character of its author. He knew Mr. LORING abhorred these resolutions, and had ever most strenuously opposed them, and therefore he took care not to say that he voted for them, or assented to them, or ever knew of their existence, but that his "*name was published in connexion*" with them.

Then Mr. HALLETT adds, "and he *has never* PUBLICLY *disclaimed the same.*" He well knew that Mr. LORING had again and again, to every one who mentioned the subject, utterly disclaimed the resolutions and avowed his detestation of the principles of them. He also well knew he had openly and boldly, in many large meetings, before and after the resolutions had passed, opposed and denounced them. Look at the artfulness and disingenuity of the language. Mr. HALLETT does not say that Mr. Loring had not disclaimed the resolutions, and therefore admits that he had, — but he says he had "*never* PUBLICLY *disclaimed the same.*" He had done it before large assemblies. Was not this *public* enough? But (see the subterfuge) he had not done it in a newspaper! His speeches were not reported and he had not published a manifesto! But Mr. Hallett alledges Mr. *Loring's* nomination was confirmed by a majority of one. Indeed! The Council consists of ten members, including the Lt. Governor. Their assent or dissent in relation to all their acts must appear, according to the constitution, under their signatures on the record. Every member, in some stage of the business, gave his opinion. Mr. Hallett says *three* dissented, leaving *seven* who assented, — and is this Mr. Hallett's majority of one? Mr. Hallett has published what he calls his protest, and says it is "*in the records*" of the Council. Not a word of it is *on record!* But we heard, in the time of it, the history

of this protest, and we think Mr. HALLETT's course justifies us in giving it to the public. Mr. LORING's nomination was confirmed on the 21st of December. Afterwards, in the month of January, Mr. HALLETT presented to the Secretary the protest, of which he has published a copy, and requested him to insert it *in the records* of that day's proceedings. To which the Secretary very properly replied, that he could not do so, for the records being made up and signed, it would be FORGERY for him to insert anything. Mr. HALLETT being foiled in this attempt, then requested the Secretary to file it as of the 21st of December; to which the Secretary replied that a filing to that effect would be a falsehood and he could not do it. But he would take it and put it with the papers received in January. And this is the *extraordinary* way in which this protest got among the papers of the Executive. No one knew better than Mr. HALLETT that it was not in any sense *on record.* And the language in which he says it was "*in the records*" is so artful and peculiar that it must have been designed for *deception.* No *lawyer* could *accidentally* say that a paper was "placed *on file in the records.*" So much then for the tissue of prevarication, artifice and falsehood, in relation to the appointment of E. G. LORING. We might say more but we forbear, and we will only add that if Mr. HALLETT will deny any of the facts stated, in a way to enable us to compel the attendance of witnesses, we are ready to establish every tittle of them, by incontrovertable evidence. But in any view of the case how is Gov. MORTON affected? Does the appointment of an abolitionist make a man an abolitionist? Is DAVID HENSHAW an abolitionist? Is JOHN TYLER an abolitionist? And yet DAVID HENSHAW procured JOHN TYLER to appoint to an important office a regular and active member of an abolition society, — who openly advocated their strongest measures, and in a large assembly publicly declared that if Slavery could not be abolished without violating the Constitution, then PERISH the CONSTITUTION.

One other thing and I will leave the subject. Mr. HALLETT artfully introduces other people to say things which he knows to be *false;* and for which he fears to be responsible. He makes the following quotations from a letter of Mr. Henshaw. — "*First, an act was passed and approved by Gov. Morton, authorizing marriages between negroes and whites,*" — a reference to the records of the Legislature will show this to be FALSE. There was an old

law forbidding marriages between negroes, and mulattoes, and whites, which had been a dead letter for many years. It was offensive to some people, and the Legislature thought proper to repeal it, leaving all to their natural rights, just as they stand in nearly all the states of the Union, and especially in the Slave States. And because Gov. *Morton* did not exercise the high prerogative of the Veto, he is to be denounced.

Second. — The Legislature, with great unanimity, passed a bill prohibiting the State officers from executing the laws of the U.States, in certain cases. This is an old States' right doctrine, often exercised by Virginia,and other Southern States ; and because Gov. *Morton* did not throw discord into the party by *vetoing* it, he is condemned as an *abolitionist.* The State and national officers are totally distinct, and derive their authority from entirely different sources, and true wisdom requires their jurisdictions to be kept separate, and that they should not be allowed to exercise each other's powers, and thus produce conflict and confusion between agents of different Governments.

But, *Thirdly*, says Mr. HENSHAW, "*he approved the resolves under which* Mr. HOAR *and* Mr. HUBBARD *were appointed on their negro mission to Charleston and N. Orleans.*" Every tyro in politics knows there is not one word of truth in this statement.

In 1843 the Legislature passed a resolve authorizing the Gov. to appoint agents *residing* in Charleston and New Orleans, to look after the interest of Massachusetts seamen, and to see that they received the protection which by law they were entitled to. Under this resolve, Gov. *Morton* appointed highly respectable citizens of Charleston and N. Orleans — but they declined to act under the appointment. In 1844 the Whigs, with the approval of Gov. *Briggs*, passed the resolve under which *Hoar* and *Hubbard* were appointed.

Then, again, we have quoted from the Hampden Post, edited by a reformed officer, that Gov. MORTON'S "*appointments have generally been from the anti-Texas side of the House.*" What shall be said of a resident in Boston, who will make or repeat such an assertion ? Among the *thirty* or *forty* appointments made by Gov. MORTON there cannot be found ONE who is not a thorough democrat — who is not *decidedly* in favor of the admission of Texas, and who did not vote for *Polk and Dallas* and the whole democratic ticket.

But, says *Mr. Henshaw* in the language quoted, "*the whole policy of Mr. Morton's administration was bent, and the democratic party was prostituted, to please the abolition party, and to serve the abolition cause.*" A more bold and daring falsehood could not be uttered. It is a gross insult, not only to each member of the Legislature but to the whole democratic party. It is on a par with the declaration that the Slavery resolutions of Mr. HALLETT were rejected "at the instance of the more immediate friends of Gov. MORTON." The convention saw, at once, that these resolutions were offered by Mr. *Hallett*, in violation of all his former professions, with a view of aiding his application for office at Washington; and that they were an indignity to all the members of the Legislatures of 1843 and 1844 — and they were rejected with indignation, and almost entire unanimity. To connect their rejection with Gov. MORTON involves the absurd supposition that he could *forsee* Mr. HALLETT's secret design, and that the members of the Convention were subservient tools.

A more unfounded charge than that of the abolition of Gov. MORTON, or one supported by more "false facts" never was advanced. Not a prominent man can be found in Massachusetts, against whom stronger proofs of abolitionism may not be had. Mr. Whittier speaks *truly* when he says, "we had them from such men as Gov. Everett, Parmenter, Williams, A. H. Everett, Cushing and Rantoul, (all of whom have been before the Senate) far more flattering and favorable than from Gov. MORTON."

No! — every man in N. England knows the charge to be a calumny. Gov. MORTON is, in principle, opposed to Slavery, and he has the independence to avow his sentiments. But he is also decidedly in favor of maintaining to the letter and the spirit, the legal and constitutional rights of the South, and opposed to any interference with the peculiar institutions of the Slaveholding States; and he never hesitated to rebuke the *abolitionists* for their dangerous and fanatical measures. If these principles will form any objection to his confirmation by the U. S. Senate, let those who wish to remove him, to obtain promotion for themselves, make the most of them. But let them remember, that TENFOLD as strong objections, of the same nature, can be urged against them.

We think we have effectually disposed of the charge of *abolitionism*, against Gov. MORTON — by showing its groundlessness, and

the falsity of the several allegations, by which it was attempted to be supported. The next accusation which the same writer, in the Post of the 18th ultimo urges against Gov. *Morton*, is the mismanagement of the appointing power. This is a power extremely difficult to exercise, and one which can never be used without giving dissatisfaction to some. Those who are *removed* will of course be offended — and those who are disappointed in their application for office, will also find fault. Every applicant for office thinks his claim better than that of any other one; and when there are *fifty* applicants for every office, *forty-nine* of them must be disappointed, and will complain of the appointing power.

Now it is very apparent that *all* the complaint against the Collector originates with disappointed office-seekers, or removed officers. No objection arises from any other source. The great mass of the party, and of the community, are entirely satisfied. Indeed so highly was his course approved, that almost all the democratic importing merchants, and other leading democrats in Boston, spontaneously, and without the knowledge of the Collector, forwarded to the President their testimonials, approving the whole course of the Collector, and especially the discretion and wisdom shown in his removals and appointments.

This writer accuses Gov. *Morton* of *retaining Whigs*, of *removing democrats*, and of *giving a preference to Van Buren-men*. In attempting to support these charges he has brought together a series of errors and falsehoods, with scarcely a solitary truth among them. He has misstated the number of removals — the number of appointments — the number of democrats removed — the number of whigs retained. He dare not assert that any whig has been appointed. He only ventured to put down *one* as doubtful, viz.: George Bliss — his own neighbor from boyhood — an old democrat, who was supporting the party, when Mr. *Hallet* was fighting in the ranks of its enemies. Why were the names of Hilliard, Abell, Montague and others left out of the list of removals? Why was Tyler numbered among the Democrats, and Spooner and Story called *doubtful?* Are they not all Whigs? Is not Montague, of *Chelsea Bank* notoriety, a Whig? Is not Story, the late Cashier of the famous *Nahant Bank*, a Whig? It would be just as correct to call *William Hayden*, doubtful. But it is invidious to bring

individual names before the public in this manner, and I will not disturb private feelings by farther remarks of this kind.

But I have taken great pains to ascertain the real facts in relation to this matter. And to show the writer's utter disregard of truth, and his total misrepresentation of all the facts, I will briefly state them, vouching for their accuracy as near as it is practicable to obtain them.

The writer in the Post asserts, that when Gov. *Morton* came into office, there were THIRTY, or more whigs in office — and that he still retains "*eighteen or twenty Whigs in office.*" Gov. *Morton* was not responsible for the number of Whigs in office, when he came in. This is a charge against his predecessor, if anybody. He was a Democrat, and we never heard that the writer in the Post complained of his conduct.

But how does this writer make the number of whigs so large? He includes all the whigs in the Naval office and the Appraiser's office, over which the Collector has no more control than he has over the appointments of Gov. Briggs. The Naval Officer has the appointment of *four* officers. Of these, *three* were whigs when Mr. Parmenter was appointed; and he has never made a single removal. In the Appraiser's office there were *three or four* whigs, not one of whom has been removed by the Appraiser. But no complaint is made of this. Now deducting these officers there would remain, according to the writer in the Post, only *twelve* Whigs holding office under Gov. *Morton.* But this is altogether incorrect, and we intend to show the *entire falsity* of the whole statement.

Omitting the officers in the Naval office and the Appraiser's department, and also the *night watchmen,* (as not being of sufficient importance to be numbered in the list of officers) and there are, under the Collector, of every grade, *one hundred and three* officers. Of these, when Gov. *Morton* was appointed, *seventy-seven* were democrats — *twenty* were whigs — and six doubtful. Of these Gov. Morton has removed SIXTEEN whigs, NINE democrats, and THREE doubtful. As all the new officers are democrats, this will leave the Custom House official corps now to stand NINETY-SIX Democrats, FOUR Whigs, and THREE doubtful. Will any democrat now complain of want of party fidelity in the Collector, or censure him for retaining too many whigs? If so, let him give the Collector longer time and see if the error be not corrected. But before he does this

let him compare his conduct with those of the other departments in the Custom House, and with his democratic predecessors, Henshaw, Bancroft, Rantoul and Williams, not one of whom made so thorough a change. But, says this writer in the Post, he removed *democrats.* Indeed, and did he not put in democrats, and better men too than he removed? And is the doctrine of ROTATION all a humbug, to deceive the people? And because a man has held an office any length of time, has he a better claim than another who has not had an office at all? This is a new doctrine to come from a democratic source. And I do not hesitate to declare that if the Collector did commit an error it was not in removing *too many* but *too few* democrats. We want to see the doctrine of *rotation* carried into full practice; and believe nothing retards the growth of the party so much as the failure to practice the principles we profess. And we do not hesitate to say that the clamor which interested individuals have got up against a few democratic changes, has deeply injured the party. We know some of the men removed, we know they were new democrats, recently come into our ranks. We are among those, and we believe the number is great, who while they desire to receive new converts with favor, think some preference is due to old and tried democrats, and do not believe that the dismissal of those who were fighting us in the desperate battle of 1840, or making terms with the enemy, and the substitution in their places of the faithful soldiers who stood by us in that and all other trials, is any cause of complaint. But we were in a situation to know something of these changes and the causes of them. We know that the Collector bestowed great labor and care in the investigation of these cases, — in inquiries into the moral character, the official competency, and the fitness for office, of the incumbents as well as the applicants. And we then understood, and we doubt not correctly, that not one officer who was called or pretended to be a democrat was removed but for cause in relation to his moral character, or his official fidelity or competency, and that the cause was communicated to the Secretary and approved by him. The pretended communication from Gov. Morton to Secretary Walker, published in the Post, cannot be *genuine.* The writer could have obtained it only from Gov. *Morton,* his *confidential clerk,* or the Secretary himself. The Secretary, or the Collector, of course, would not give copies of their correspondence; and Mr. ENGLISH, the Collec-

tor's clerk, is too well known to be suspected of such gross infidelity — and we are not a little surprised that the Post should have admitted such an implication into its columns. Of course, this, like most of the other statements in that article, is the mere figment of the author's brain.

But the writer in the Post accuses Gov. *Morton* of showing a partiality to Van Buren men. This, like all the other accusations, will prove, upon investigation, to be without foundation.

It is well known, that, when Gov. *Morton* was appointed, the office was filled, almost exclusively, with anti-Van Buren men; and, of course, if he removed any, it must be men of that description. — But we do not believe, that he enquired, in a single instance, into the presidential predilictions of the candidates, or the office-holders. We were assured, and fully believed, that he looked solely to the moral character and official qualifications of the parties — and it required not a little assurance in the writer to make this accusation. For, although a very large majority of the party in this State were Van Buren men, yet it is notorious that now, after the changes complained of, there are, in the Custom House, more than *twice* as many *opponents* as *friends* of Mr. Van Buren. The latter then, if any one, and not the former, have cause of complaint. But so fair and impartial was the Collector, and so regardless of Presidential preferences in his decisions, that, of the three or four Van Buren men in office, there were removed more than three times as many in proportion to the whole number as of the friends of any, or all of the other candidates — and in the new appointments there may be found friends of all the different candidates, in what proportion we do not know, — nor do we believe that the Collector ever knew.

We have no means of judging of each particular case; but, from the known fairness and ability of the Collector to investigate questions, and from the total absence, on his part, of any motive to do anything injurious to the democratic party or the administration, we have no doubt that the most wise and judicious course was adopted. What inducement could the Collector have to do otherwise? He has not appointed a single relative or personal friend. His predecessors — *Henshaw*, *Lincoln*, *Rantoul* and *Williams* had family connections and dependents to provide for — not so with *Gov. Morton*. In this respect his example is worthy of all

praise. He looked abroad, over the whole State, and selected, from every County, some of her most able, worthy and respectable citizens. Where is the man who can see the officers appointed, and comparing them with those removed, will not say that much has been done to improve the respectability and efficiency of the Custom House corps? Well might the most respectable democratic merchants and citizens of Boston volunteer, to the President, their approbation of the propriety and wisdom of the removals and appointments in the Custom House, and of its general administration. Never were the business men so well satisfied with the general execution of the revenue laws.

We have, in answer to charges against the Collector, which we think not only groundless but malicious, deemed it necessary to say thus much relative to the manner in which he has conducted the affairs of that important office. Were it necessary, we might go much further — but a man of his character and standing can need no defence from us, or any one else. He is identified with the democratic party from its origin — he has never shown infidelity, disingenuity or duplicity. An attack upon him, is an attack upon the party. He has been selected by the President, and personally solicited by him to accept the office — and with a knowledge of all the facts he has nominated him to the Senate. Opposition to the Collector is, therefore, virtually opposition to the President. The Senate will not hesitate to confirm the nomination. If they regard the wishes of all the business men of Boston—if they regard the voice of the democratic party in and out of Massachusetts — if they desire the services of a man of unquestioned integrity, of spotless purity of character, of tried and undoubted democracy, and of pre-eminent qualifications, they will unanimously confirm the nomination.

But "*the howling office-seeker*" could not close his attack upon *Gov. Morton* without exposing his own folly by accusing him of DUPLICITY, in relation to the Rhode Island suffrage movement and to *Gov. Dorr*. "We thank thee Jew" for this. If there is any point in which Gov. *Morton's* patriotism, democracy, and sincere devotion to principle are pre-eminent — it is this.

He was the first man, who, in their darkest hour of trial, took a bold and firm stand in their support, and turned the current of public opinion in their favor. His able, argumentative and unanswerable

letter to the Seekonk Clam Bake, will not soon be forgotten by Rhode Island suffrage men. So we find him, on all occasions, in numerous public meetings and private conversations, down to the very last demonstration, the "liberation fête," maintaining his stand in favor of the suffrage cause, and of *Gov. Dorr*, its leader. And when on the Committee of Resolutions in the Baltimore Convention, Gov. *Morton* proposed a resolution in favor of Gov. *Dorr*, which received the sympathy of the whole Committee, and was only omitted because they deemed it improper to include any local subjects. So much then, for the charge of Gov. *Morton's* hostility to the Rhode Island suffrage cause and to Gov. *Dorr*. And what shall be said, or thought of the man, who, in the face of such facts, and in the full knowledge of them, can present such an accusation.

But, says this writer, Gov. *Morton refused* to call in the warrant, *which* Gov. *Davis* had issued on the requisition of the Governor of Rhode Island. We do not hesitate to pronounce the statement, that "*applications were made to* Gov. MORTON *to recall the warrant*," untrue — no sensible man would ever think of such an application. We are no lawyer, but we are of opinion, that a warrant of this description expires with the Executive who grants it; — and that this warrant was *defunct* the moment Gov. *Davis'* functions ceased. But be this as it may, Gov. *Morton* could not recall the warrant, and any attempt to do it would have been ridiculous and disgraceful. How should he have done it. Issue a proclamation? — how absurd! or appoint a special agent to go and demand it of the sheriff who held it? Where is the Governor's authority to appoint such agent, or to interfere with the sheriffs in their service of precepts?

But there is a shorter and more conclusive answer to this foolish charge. If the warrant were dead, it would have been ridiculous to have interfered with a *defunct* precept. If it were valid, and binding, the Governor had no power to recall it; so that, in either case, any interference by the Governor would have been disgraceful to himself and to the State over which he presided.

But *Gov. Dorr* did not attend the Faneuil Hall supper, and *Gov. Morton* is charged with his absence. Why he staid away, we know not — there may have been a hundred reasons why he should not have travelled from New Hampshire at that season of the year. But we venture to assert that nothing which *Gov. Morton did*, or

omitted, had any influence. What should he have done? It would not have been consistent with his station, to have sent a special invitation, or a military escort. This no one advised or proposed — it would have been manifestly derogatory to the position he held. But he actually did more, in this case, than was ever done for any other Governor. He voluntarily gave assurances to Gov. *Dorr's* friends, to be communicated to him, if they chose, that if he would come into the State, he should receive the same treatment and attention that would be shown to the Goveruor of New Hampshire, New York, or any other State. And we would ask what more Gov. *Morton* could have done?

The writer very jesuitically states, that *Gov. Dorr* afterwards visited Boston, but he and *Gov. Morton* did not exchange calls." This is entirely deceptive. But if it were not, it would only be casting a reproach upon Gov. *Dorr* — for the established usage, never deviated from, required him to make the first call. But, in our opinion he was not guilty of such an indecorum, any more than he was of the intimation, which the writer says was contained in his unpublished letter. The statement, though it may be literally correct, was intended to *deceive*. It is true, *Gov. Dorr* was in Boston, but never at the same time when *Gov. Morton* was there, and for this reason they did not exchange calls.

But I am tired of exposing the false statements of this writer, and I will close in the full confidence that the Government as well as people, will do ample justice to the patriot and Statesman, whom the writer and other disappointed office-seekers have so unjustly attacked,

TRUTH.